



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/753,297

01/08/2004

Steven M. Miller

RSW920030284US1

7583

51016

7590

03/03/2009

IBM CORP. (RALEIGH SOFTWARE GROUP)  
c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

WONG, WILLIAM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/753,297	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MILLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> WILLIAM WONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 58 and 59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58 and 59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the communication filed on 11/24/2008.

- Claims 1-57 have been cancelled.
- Claims 58-59 have been added.

Claims 58-59 are pending and has been examined. Previous objections and rejections to the claims have been withdrawn in view of cancelled claim 57.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 58-59 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 58, it is unclear whether “an intelligent agenda program” in line 4 is referring to “an intelligent agenda program” in line 1, or is different. “a second plurality of user inputs” raises question as to why the first plurality of inputs was not mentioned (it is suggested that the word “second” be removed). “the menu” in lines 8 and 13 should be replaced with “the options menu” for consistency and clarity. There is lack of antecedent basis for “the intelligent agenda” in line 8. It is unclear whether “the plurality of slides” is referring to “a first plurality of slides” in line 1, or is different (it is suggested that the word “first” be removed). It is unclear whether “a first set of user inputs” is a first set of the “plurality of user inputs” in line 6, or is different. “each slide” in lines 16 and 17 should be replaced with “each of the plurality of slides” for consistency and clarity. It is unclear whether “a second set of user inputs” is a second set of the “plurality of user inputs” in line 6, or is different. There is lack of antecedent basis for “the number of lines”. It is unclear how responsive to the second set of user inputs,

Art Unit: 2178

“causing the user to select” options. It would seem that the user inputs are the user selections. “a third plurality of titles” raises question as to why a first and second plurality of titles were not mentioned. It is unclear whether the “third plurality of titles” is part of the accessed “plurality of titles” or are different. It is unclear whether “a line limitation” is referring to the “limiting the number of lines”, or is different. It is unclear whether “the second user input” is referring to or part of the “second set of user inputs” or is different. It is unclear whether the “fourth plurality of titles” is part of the accessed “plurality of titles” or are different.

As per claim 59, “wherein displaying...computer” should be replaced with “wherein said displaying...computer” for clarity. The claim refers to “modifying the intelligent agenda” in the previous claim, but the phrase does not exist in claim 58. It is unclear which plurality of user inputs “the plurality of user inputs” is referring to. It appears that “a third user input” should be “a third set of user inputs to the graphical user interface”. It is unclear whether the “fifth plurality of titles” is part of the accessed “plurality of titles” or are different.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2178

3. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim recites “limiting the number of lines on the outline”. Note that the claim recites that a created outline is later adapted “to be displayed”, suggesting that the term “outline” refers to a structure of accessed titles before display. Under this interpretation, it is the number of *displayed* lines of the outline that are limited as described in the specification, not the number of lines on the outline (see paragraph 54, “When the number of lines in the outline exceeds the number of display lines...limit the number of lines *displayed* on the intelligent agenda”).

Therefore, “limiting the number of lines on the outline” in the context of the claim is not supported by the original disclosure and constitutes new matter. Additionally, it appears that “the outline is modified to display” should be “the *intelligent agenda* is modified to display”, according to the specification, as noted above.

4. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 59 recites "limiting...without regard to the line limitation" to refer to figure 11 item 476, but the specification describing figure 11 item 476 (in paragraph 55) specifically states that the limiting "subject to the limitations in limiting the number of lines options 474", which appears to be a direct contradiction. As such, this is not supported by the original disclosure and constitutes new matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause et al. (US 6154757), Dieberger et al. (US 2003/0122863 A1), Fullerton et al. (US 2001/0033296 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000).

As per independent claim 58, as best understood by examiner, Krause teaches **a computer implemented method for adding an intelligent agenda to a document presentation program stored in a memory connected to a computer, the computer implemented method comprising: loading a configuration program and an intelligent agenda program** (e.g. in column 8 lines 27-33 and column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64) **into the memory** (e.g. in column 4 lines 62-67 and figure 1), **wherein the intelligent agenda program is adapted to interface with the presentation program** (e.g. in column 8 lines 27-29) **and to respond to a second plurality of user inputs to a graphical user interface of the configuration program** (e.g. in column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64); **responsive to a user invoking an options menu on the presentation program and selecting an intelligent agenda option on the menu** (e.g. in column 4 lines 31-43 and column 8 lines 27-34), **creating the intelligent agenda by accessing a plurality of titles from the document in the**

Art Unit: 2178

**presentation program to create an outline** (e.g. in column 8 lines 27-33 and column 25 lines 3-24), **adapting the outline to be displayed in a corner on** the presentation (e.g. in figures 4 and 13-15); **further responsive to the user selecting the intelligent agenda option on the menu, displaying the graphical user interface on a display of the computer** (e.g. in column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64); **introducing a line to the presentation, the line connecting to each of two contiguous border lines on the presentation to define a corner section containing the outline** (e.g. in figures 4 and 13-15); **responsive to a set of user inputs to the graphical user interface, limiting the number of lines on the outline** (e.g. in column 25 lines 43-48) **and causing the user to select a display option, wherein when the user selects the display option, the outline is modified to display a third plurality of titles that precede a current title subject to a line limitation of the user input, and then only when the line limitation has not been met, displaying a fourth plurality of titles that follow the title until the line limitation is met** (e.g. in column 25 lines 43-48), but does not specifically teach wherein the document comprises **a first plurality of slides, corner of each of the plurality of slides, and further adapting the outline to track a user's progression through a presentation of the plurality of slides by a pointer that automatically moves to a title in the outline corresponding to a currently displayed slide; responsive to a first set of user inputs to the graphical user interface, introducing a user configurable line to each slide, the user configurable line connecting to each of two contiguous border lines on each slide; and responsive to a second set of user inputs to the graphical user interface, causing the user to select a**

Art Unit: 2178

first display option, wherein, **when the user selects the first display option, the outline is modified to display only the title in the outline corresponding to the currently displayed slide, a preceding title located immediately before the title, and a following title located immediately after the title.**

However, Dieberger teaches displaying an outline for a plurality of slides for presentation (e.g. in paragraphs 20-21 and 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Krause to include the slideshow (i.e. plurality of slides) of Dieberger because slideshows were well known files for presentation (e.g. in paragraphs 3 and 20).

Dieberger further teaches wherein the outline is adapted to be displayed in a corner on each slide (e.g. in figure 1, outline is shown in the upper left corner, and in abstract, in paragraphs 20-21 and 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Krause to include the outline placement of Dieberger as an alternate display mode that would provide more viewing space for the presentation content, and easily display the contextual information in a non-intrusive manner (e.g. in paragraph 21 and 25).

Fullerton teaches adapting an outline to track a user's progression through a presentation of a plurality of slides by a pointer that automatically moves to a title in the outline corresponding to a currently displayed slide (e.g. in paragraphs 114 and 185). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of the combination of Krause and Dieberger to include the pointer of Fullerton for the purpose of providing a user with progress feedback.



Art Unit: 2178

Krause further teaches accepting user inputs to a graphical user interface of menus and submenus to modify properties of the outline (e.g. in column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64) and it was also well known in the art to, responsive to a set of user inputs to a graphical user interface, introduce a user configurable line to an element that connects two contiguous border lines on a slide (note that the claim language does not require that the lines be borders *of* the slide, but broadly refers to any two contiguous border lines *on* a slide, i.e. includes border lines of any elements displayed on the slide), as shown by Microsoft (e.g. in figures 5-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the outline of the combination of Krause, Dieberger, and Fullerton to include the configurability of Microsoft for the purpose of providing the presentation creator the ability to modify the appearance of the outline.

Krause further teaches responsive to a set of user inputs to a graphical user interface of menus and submenus, causing the user to select a display option to modify properties of the outline (e.g. in column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64) and Dieberger further teaches providing a means to only display the current, preceding, and following slide (e.g. in paragraph 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the outline titles of the combination of Krause, Dieberger, Fullerton, and Microsoft to include only the current, preceding, and following slide of Dieberger for the purpose of allowing a user to easily display only a basic indication of context for the presentation.

As per claim 59, the rejection of claim 58 is incorporated and, as best understood by examiner, the combination further teaches **responsive to a third user input, limiting a fifth plurality of titles to be displayed in the outline to either the third plurality of titles that precede the title, or to the fourth plurality of titles that follow the title, and without regard to the line limitation** (e.g. Krause, in column 25 line 25 – column 26 line 64).

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20020186236 A1	System and method for electronic presentations	Brown, Christopher Robert et al.
US 6665835 B1	Real time media journaler with a timing event coordinator	Gutfreund; Steven et al.
US 6802041 B1	Multimedia word processor	Rehm; Peter H
US 20050091579 A1	Retrieving slide show content from presentation documents	Mewherter, Duncan L. et al.
US 20050216431 A1	Dynamic presentation generator	Baker, John et al.
US 20050223314 A1	System and method for automatic generation of presentations based on agenda	Varadarajan, Sridhar et al.
US 20050251731 A1 US 20060008789 A1	Video slide based presentations	Valderas, Harold Michael et al. Gerteis; Wolfgang

Art Unit: 2178

E-learning course extractor

US 20060200455 A1

Search engine result reporter

Wilson; Eric Cameron

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM WONG** whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Wong/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Adam L Basehoar/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178